

## REMARKS

Claims 5-6, 8, 18, 20 and 27, without prejudice, were previously cancelled.

Claims 13 and 24 have now been also cancelled, without prejudice.

Claims 1, 3, 10-12, 14-15, 22-23, 25 and 29 have been amended. All amendments are fully supported. No new matter has been introduced.

Accordingly, claims 1-4, 7, 9-12, 14-17, 19, 21-23, 25-26 and 28-33 are now pending

### Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e)

Claims 1-4, 7, 9-15, 17, 19, 21-26, and 28-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,243,039, to Elliot ("Elliot").

Rejections of claims 13 and 24 have been rendered moot by their cancellations.

Claim 1 has been amended, and it is patentable over Elliott because Elliott does not teach the required "receiving from the mobile client device, identification of a first recipient eligible to receive location information of a user of the mobile client device", and "receiving from the mobile client device, a current location of the user".

Elliott teaches a number of approaches for specifying the recipients of the location information of the subject being monitored, but none of the approaches includes the mobile client device providing the location information of a user, provides the identification of the eligible recipient.

Accordingly, claim 1 is patentable over Elliott.

Claims 14 and 22 include the same required recitations of claim 1. Accordingly, for at least the same reasons, claims 14 and 22 are patentable over Elliott.

Claims 2-4, 7, 9-12, 15, 17, 19, 21, 23, 25-26, and 28-30 are dependent on either claim 1, 14, or 22, incorporating their limitations respectively. Therefore, for at least the same reasons, claims 2-4, 7, 9-12, 15, 17, 19, 21, 23, 25-26, and 28-30

are patentable over Elliot.

Rejection of claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claim 16 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Elliot in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,542,075, to Barker et al. ("Barker").

Barker does not remedy deficiencies of Elliot. Therefore, claim 14 remains patentable over Elliott even when combined with Barker.

Claim 16 is dependent on claim 14, incorporating its limitations. Therefore, for at least the same reasons, claim 16 is patentable over Elliot and Barker combined.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, claims 1-4, 7, 9-12, 14-17, 19, 21-23, 25-26 and 28-30 are in condition for allowance. Early issuance of the Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Please charge any shortages and credit any overages of payment of fees to Deposit Account No. 500393.

Respectfully submitted,

SCHWABE, WILLIAMSON & WYATT

Dated: June 23, 2005



Al AuYeung  
Reg. No. 35,432

Pacwest Center, Suites 1600-1900  
1211 SW Fifth Avenue  
Portland, Oregon 97204  
503-796-2437